

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

RAMELLO DARRYL RANDLE,

Plaintiff,

v.

CONTRA COSTA COUNTY, et al.,

Defendants.

Case No. [24-cv-04759-JSC](#)

**ORDER OF DISMISSAL**

Plaintiff was an inmate at the Contra Costa County Jail (“MDF”) proceeding without an attorney when he filed this civil rights action under 42 U.S.C. § 1983. As explained in the Order dated November 12, 2024:

On September 20, 2024, the Court received a letter from Plaintiff stating he would be released from the MDF on September 26, 2024, and would update his address with the Court in this and his two other pending cases.<sup>1</sup> (ECF No. 3.) In addition, mail sent to Plaintiff at his MDF address in his other case has recently been returned. *See Randle v. Marcotte, et al.*, No. 23-5800 JSC (PR) (ECF No. 22). Plaintiff has not provided the Court with a new address.

(ECF No. 6 at 1 (footnote in original).) The Court therefore ordered Plaintiff as follows:

On or before January 6, 2025, Plaintiff shall notify the Court of his current valid mailing address. If he fails to do so or show cause why not, this case may be dismissed under Civil Local Rule 3-11 without prejudice 60 days after the return of any mail to him as undeliverable.

(*Id.* at 2.)

Plaintiff has not notified the Court of his current valid mailing address or otherwise communicated with the Court. The address he provided when he opened this case (at the MDF) is

<sup>1</sup> *Randle v. Marcotte, et al.*, No. C 23-5800 JSC (PR); *Randle v. Lopes, et al.*, No. C 24-6574 JSC (PR).

1 not a valid address because mail sent to him there in his other case was twice returned as  
2 undeliverable, including after the November 12, 2024 Order in this case to notify the Court of his  
3 address. *See Randle v. Marcotte, et al.*, No. C 23-5800 JSC (PR) (ECF Nos. 23, 25.)

4 Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 41(b) allows the involuntary dismissal of an action or a  
5 claim for “failure of the plaintiff to prosecute or comply with these rules or any order of the  
6 court.” A district court may sua sponte dismiss an action pursuant to Rule 41(b). *See Link v.*  
7 *Wabash R.R.*, 370 U.S. 626, 633 (1962). But such a dismissal should be only when the failure to  
8 comply is unreasonable. *McKeever v. Block*, 932 F.2d 795, 797 (9th Cir. 1991). There are  
9 grounds for dismissal of this case under Rule 41(b) because Plaintiff has not complied with the  
10 order to notify the Court of his current valid mailing address by January 6, 2025 (ECF No. 6), and  
11 he has made no contact with the Court to provide a reasonable explanation for this lack of  
12 compliance.

13 Accordingly, pursuant to Rule 41(b) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, this case is  
14 DISMISSED without prejudice to refiling a new case in which Plaintiff provides and maintains his  
15 current mailing address.

16 The Clerk shall enter judgment and close the file.

17 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

18 Dated: January 10, 2025

19  
20   
21 JACQUELINE SCOTT CORLEY  
22 United States District Judge  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28